REMARKS

Claims 23, 27 and 29-35 have been amended. Claims 1-22, 24-26 and 28 have been canceled without prejudice. Subsequent to the entry of the present amendment, claims 23, 27 and 29-35 are pending and at issue. These amendments add no new matter as the claim language is fully supported by the specification and original claims.

Applicant acknowledges that the Examiner has withdrawn the species election, thus SEQ ID NOs:5-15 have been examined together.

Applicant also acknowledges that claims 26 and 27 are otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. It is noted that claim 23 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 24 to 26, hence claim 23 and dependent claims therefrom are in condition for allowance, and such is respectfully requested.

I. Amendment to the Claims

Claims 23, 27 and 29-35 have been amended, in part, to improve their form. Claim 23 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 24 to 26, which have been canceled.

No new matter has been added.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph (enablement)

Claims 23-25 and 28-35 are rejected under on 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one of skill in the art to make or use the invention. The rejection is moot with regard to claims 24-25 and 28, which have been canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as it applies to the pending claims.

According to the Office Action, the specification is "enabling for methods of stimulating neurogenesis comprising contacting neural stem or progenitor cells with prokineticin peptide agonists selected from the group SEQ ID NOs:5-15". However, according to the Office Action, the specification is not enabling for "any" potential agonist of "any" chemical class, nor "any" methods comprising administration of PKR antagonist. See page 3 of the Office Action.

Claim 23 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 24 to 26, which have been cancelled, and is directed to a PKR peptide agonist selected from a group selected from SEQ ID NOs:5-11 and 14-15. Claim 28, directed to a PKR antagonist, has been canceled.

The specification sufficiently provides direction and/or guidance to enable any skilled person in the art to use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

Additionally, although Applicant does not agree with the rejection, in the interest of advancing prosecution of the present application, claim 28, directed to a PKR peptide antagonist, has been canceled.

Accordingly, withdrawal of rejection of claims 23-25 and 28-35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph (written description)

Claims 23, 24 and 28-35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, as allegedly being indefinite for failing the written description requirement. The rejection is moot with regard to claims 24 and 28, which have been canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as it applies to the pending claims.

According to the Office Action, the claims are drawn to methods that comprise administration of "genera of compounds", agonists and antagonists, that modulate PKR signaling.

Claim 23 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 24 to 26, and is directed to a PKR peptide agonist selected from a group selected from SEQ ID NOs:5-11 and 14-15. As discussed in detail above, the specification, in particular, Example V clearly describes that administration of recombinant human prokineticin 2 (PK2) to adult rats via intracerebroventricular infusion resulted in an increased number of newly developed neurons in the forebrain. These findings indicate a role for signaling through prokineticin receptors in the regulation of neurogenesis. Hence, the claimed methods, which comprise contacting cells with PKR peptides comprising the amino acids set forth in SEQ ID NOs:5-11 and 14-15, is described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that Applicant had possession of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, withdrawal of rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as it applies to the pending claims.

According to the Office Action, there is no antecedent basis for the phrase, "said human cell" in claim 35. Claim 35 has been amended and now depends on claim 34, which provides antecedent basis for the "said human cell".

Accordingly, withdrawal of rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

V. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 23-25, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly anticipated by Mollay et al. *Eur J Pharmacol* 1999 June 18, 374(2):189-196. The rejection with regard to claims 24-25 is moot, as the claims have been canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as it applies to the pending claims.

To anticipate, a single reference must inherently or expressly teach each and every element of claimed invention. *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed Cir. 1990); and *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). MPEP § 2131. Further, the claimed invention must be distinct from what is apparently inherent in the reference, and the reference must be enabling to place the allegedly disclosed matter in the possession of the public. *In re Fitzgerald et al.*, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980); and *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 1 USPQ2d 1241, 1245 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

According to the Office Action, Mollay et al. describe administration of Bv8 proteins having the same sequences as SEQ ID NOs:12 and 13 into rat ventricles and result of which would necessarily or inherently stimulate neurogenesis as claimed.

Claim 23 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 24 to 26, and is directed to a PKR peptide agonist selected from a group selected from SEQ ID NOs:5-11 and 14-15. Mollay et al. do not anticipate the claimed invention because Mollay et al. do not describe the PKR agonists with amino acids as set forth in SEQ ID NOs:5-11 and 14-15. Therefore, Mollay et al. cannot anticipate the claimed invention.

Accordingly, withdrawal of rejection of claims 23-25, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and above remarks, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if there are any questions relating to this application.

A check in the amount of $450.00 is enclosed as payment for the two-month Extension of Time Fee. No other fees are deemed necessary with the filing of this paper. However if any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or make any credits, to Deposit Account No. 07-1896 referencing the above-identified attorney docket number. A copy of the Transmittal Sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Reg. No. 45,517

Date: May 15, 2007

for Lisa A. Haile, J.D., Ph.D.
Registration No. 38,347
Telephone: (858) 677-1456
Facsimile: (858) 677-1465

DLA PIPER US LLP
4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1100
San Diego, California 92121-2133
USPTO Customer No. 28213